DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 549 SP 034 635

AUTHOR	Gottesman, Barbara; And Others
TITLE	South Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership: Professional Development Schools. Policy Paper Series 1.3.
INSTITUTION	South Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership, Rock Hill.
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	31p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Education; *College School Cooperation; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Implementation; *School Restructuring; State Programs; Teacher Educator Education
IDENTIFIERS	Goodlad (John I); Partner Schools; *Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

In 1990, the South Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership was established by the state's legislature to provide support to schools undergoing or planning restructuring. The Center assists schools to analyze needs, establish goals, and implement those goals. Technical assistance and college and school faculty training are among the Center's tasks. The Center established a restructuring network which includes the 28 approved teacher education programs in South Carolina and more than 100 associate schools throughout the state. These schools, which become partner schools and professional development schools, have pivotal roles in driving educational change in the Center's model for school improvement. In addition, the Center is a partner in the South Carolina collaborative chosen as one of the eight Goodlad sites engaged in developing model programs that link school restructuring to teacher education reform. Five colleges and universities are partners in the collaborative: Benedict, Furman, Columbia, University of South Carolina, and Winthrop. This paper describes elements of the school/college partnership at each of these institutions, focusing on noteworthy features such as an innovative approach to college faculty load at a professional development school affiliated with the University of South Carolina, partner school criteria, and recruitment of males and persons of color for rural and neighborhood schools. The paper presents 17 guidelines for establishing statewide collaboratives to facilitate school restructuring. (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B. L Gottesman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

ED 366 549

POLICY PAPER SERIES 1.3 from the South Carolina Collaborative to Renew Teacher Education

SOUTH CAROLINA CENTER FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING AND SCHOOL LEADERSHIP: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS

by Barbara Gottesman, Patricia Graham, and Carol Nogy

published by SCCATSL 1993, 27 pages.

History and Philosophical Underpinnings of a Statewide Restructuring Center

In the fall of 1988 a small group of college administrators, the state teacher of the year, a leading business person and a policy analyst met to discuss how South Carolina might move ahead with the educational reform agenda it have carefully crafted in 1984 through the Education Improvement Act. The need for a broad based reform effort was outlined with the focus on the recognition of teachers as change agents and the need for schools and universities to work together to create different models of teacher education and school leadership. The group wanted to develop a center that would allow South Carolina to, in the words of Gene Maeroff (1988), "free local schools to design innovative programs to meet the special needs of local children." What followed were 18 months of visiting national restructuring sites, gathering information and building a constituency within the state and nation for such a center.

Discussions leading to the development of innovative grassroots programs were not new for South Carolina. The state was nationally recognized as a leader in educational reform and has made enormous strides as a result of its 1984 Education Improvement Act. Much of the impetus for school change and innovation in South Carolina was the result of two years of work by the "Task Force to Develop a New Five-Year Education Improvement Act Plan." The task force produced a 1988 report The Education Improvement Act Years Six Through Ten -- And Beyond which provided the framework for the Target 2000 legislation approved by the 1989 South Carolina General Assembly. The report spoke of the need for "greater latitude for districts, schools and teachers" and called for "bold initiatives" to attack our lingering school problems. In his 1989 State of the State address, Governor Carroll Campbell echoed these sentiments when he spoke of the need to give principals and teachers "flexibility to innovate."

SP034635

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This high-level support for school change resulted in two key Target 2000 provisions: (1) competitive planning and implementation grants for school innovation; and (2) a provision that would allow successful schools that met certain criteria to have relief from most of the state's "defined minimum standards" for school accreditation. As it shaped the task force's report into a new school improvement law, the General Assembly saw the need to include what it described as a "Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership" with a mandate to provide support to schools as they pursue bold, innovative solutions to school problems. The creation of the Center was, in effect, the statewide effort to create a process to manage change. Finally, this effort that originated with a small group of people became a reality. The South Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership was established in February 1990.

The governing body for the Center is a fifty two member Policy Board which includes the deans of all 28 approved teacher education programs, and representatives from all the administrators and teachers associations, state agencies, governor's office, business, legislature, and the last three teachers of the year. From the Policy Board, a smaller group called the Steering Committee is elected to meet monthly with the Center's Director. The fourteen member Steering Committee represents each group on the Policy Board and works closely with Center staff on policy, programs and finances.After a national search in July 1990, the Policy Board selected Dr. Barbara Gottesman to serve as Executive Director of the Center. Dr. Gottesman brought a wealth of experience as a classroom teacher, principal, and teacher educator to the Center. Her experience at the state department of education designing and implementing a statewide leadership development training program for principals and teachers won a national award in 1989. Her vision for the Center encompassed a network of schools, colleges, and business leaders moving on to a new dimension of managing change and restructuring schools to deliver services in new configurations.

This history is important to recall because it clearly reveals the intention of state policy leaders to create a meaningful, long-term support system for educational innovation and restructuring. The Center is a vital component of that system – indeed, the quality of its work, to a certain degree, determines the extent to which the school change effort is succeeding in South Carolina. The Center is based on the following conditions:

(1) The institutions involved in the Center collaborative must operate as a cohesive unit – not as discrete institutions dividing grant funds among themselves and pursuing individual projects with insufficient regard for the comprehensive nature of their mission;

(2) The vision of the Center's leaders and the content of Center programs must be deeply rooted in the emerging body of research about school change;

(3) The Center's leaders must acknowledge and respect the primary role of school administrators and teachers in the school innovation process (David, Schlechty, 1989);

(4) The Center's leaders must recognize and work to mitigate the predictable tension between policy makers who expect quick change and the organizational realities of school systems that require long-term commitment to change (Elmore, 1988.)

The Center is committed to the concept that school change is a deliberative process that requires time for all school interest groups to develop understanding and ownership (David, 1989; Sykes & Elmore, 1988; Lieberman, et. al., 1988.) Member institutions recognize that school boards, administrators, teachers and community members must finally determine for themselves what new structures will best serve the instructional needs of children in their individual schools. The task of the Center is to assist schools in analyzing needs and establishing goals, and to provide all support necessary to achieve those goals. By serving as a facilitator and information-sharer, the Center has – in the words of school change researcher Richard Elmore – helped schools "over the bumpy path of policy implementation."

How Does the Center Work with Universities and Public Schools?

Through partnerships with schools, school districts and national organizations; and through the expertise of respected scholars and practitioners in the area of school change, the Center provides cutting-edge training to college faculty and school personnel within the collaborative, who in turn serve as advisors, facilitators and resource brokers for schools seeking to change. While each of the institutions in the Center Network has faculty with some experience and interest in school change, the group recognizes that no single institution in South Carolina can lay claim to comprehensive faculty expertise in the very new field of school restructuring and innovation. The Center draws together experienced scholars and practitioners from across the United States to provide scholarly training for South Carolina faculty and to deliver direct support to innovating schools. These scholars bring a national perspective to the work of the Center and draw national attention to South Carolina's statewide school change initiatives. These scholars, such as John Goodlad, Michael Cohen, Philip Schlechty help set direction for the Center, participate in key training conferences, and provide direct support to local schools on a selective basis.

This design recognizes that there are many approaches to school change
being explored in the United States. By drawing on a variety of scholars and practitioners, the Center is able to tailor its training and technical support services to the needs of individual schools. By drawing on the experience and scholarship of consultants, the Center is training a cadre of faculty at South Carolina higher education institutions who provide technical support to local schools and develop scholarship that can be shared nationally.

The Center for School Leadership has as its mission to assist K-12 schools and colleges with innovation, restructuring and

change.The major focus of the Center in its first three years was to set up a restructuring network of Associate Schools who would make proposals and commitment to restructuring and who would serve as models for restructuring. At the present time 103 schools have been accepted into the Center's restructuring network as a result of annual requests for proposals and a written commitment to internal restructuring.

Each Associate School has a vertical restructuring team composed of two administrators, four teachers, a college partner, a business partner, a district officer, and a community member. The Center provides technical assistance, training and site visits for these schools as they begin to restructure. Each year the Center evaluates changes in teacher and college involvement in the school's reorganization and charts the progress of all the restructuring schools.

The Center provides national scholars and state practitioners as trainers in restructuring, participatory decision making, managing change, total quality education, electronic mail and specific curricular foci such as new grading, interdisciplinary units, cooperative learning, and flexible scheduling.

The Center has sponsored site visits for Associate Schools teams to visit restructuring schools in Jefferson County, Kentucky, Dade County, Florida, Provo, Utah, southern Maine, and urban Boston. Physical evidence of success has enabled many schools to persuade resisters to support school restructuring.

The electronic mail network established by the Center connects the 103 Associate Schools and their college partners through the state network and through SERVE, the southeastern federal laboratory. Training for teachers in electronic mail transmission and conferencing is provided by the Center's part time telecommunications expert on site. To make the training work, the Center also provides the modem, software, connections, and on line time for each site.

The Resource Library at the Center makes books, tapes, articles and videos available to network schools and colleges by mail and electronic mail. Regional conferences and statewide conferences enable schools to share what they have learned and accomplished.
The current interaction is site visits from schools interested in restructuring to the successful Associate Schools. The Center publishes four general restructuring newsletters about changing practice in the state's schools and four special newsletters specifically aimed at successful restructuring in 1)colleges, 2) high schools, 3) middle schools, and 4) elementary schools. In 1993, the Center published CHANGING SOUTH CAROLINA'S SCHOOLS: A RESOURCE GUIDE FOR SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES CREATING A NEW VISION OF PUBLIC EDUCATION. The guide contains 217 pages of national and state reform efforts and contact persons as well as progress reports on the 70 restructuring Associate Schools. A second book, planned for the fall of 1993, will illustrate specific success in each of the eight restructuring strands from 103 schools by way of interviews with teachers, students, parents, and administrators.

THE GOODLAD INITIATIVE: THE SOUTH CAROLINA COLLABORATIVE FOR THE RENEWAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION

As part of its initial mission during its first year, the Center for School Leadership needed to raise the level of awareness among K-12 schools for the urgency to change and restructure. The first ten model restructuring Associate Schools were chosen in July 1990 before the nationally searched director was hired. The process was also well underway to add 36 more Associate Schools to the Center's restructuring network in January 1991 with written commitments from college and business partners and district support of restructuring. Part of the Center's first year training for the Associate Schools and their college partners was to bring in national scholars on change, restructuring and renewal to increase their knowledge of the job to be done. An equally important part of the Center's first year program was to spread the awareness among schools and colleges in the state so that more would make the commitment to restructuring and partnerships.

The Center planned a series of eight regional dialogues to force proximity "collaboration" among colleges with teacher education programs and their surrounding districts. With approximately $15,000 of the Center's first year training budget, the Center Director negotiated through the 28 college representatives on the Center's Policy Board for eight colleges who would host a "Regional Dialogue" meeting. The Center handled the logistics: invitations mailed and RSVPs received from all district office personnel, teacher and principals representatives from each school in the area. The college donated the meeting space, the Center provided refreshments and printing. The Center planned each program to attract the maximum number of participants. Each of the eight Regional Dialogues had a keynote national scholar who spoke to a prescribed issue important to that area. Each was custom designed to address issues of education, economy, collaboration, and restructuring. After each keynote, the whole audience was divided into small focus groups with facilitator and recorder to ask and answer the questions: what's wrong with teacher education and how can schools and colleges collaborate. At times with 200 in the audience this procedure seemed that it might be unwieldy; but we were determined to create a model of collaboration where none had existed before this.

Because our purposes coincided, we wrote a proposal and received a small $5000 grant from the Education Commission of the States to foster communication among colleges and K-12. We were one of 25 states who received a grant, but it gave the Center's work national stature and compelled us to write an outcomes paper to share with colleges, schools, and state and national agencies.

The first of the national scholars we invited to speak about K-12 and college restructuring was John Goodlad. The Center for School Leadership hosted the first two day "Regional Dialogue" in the central capitol city Columbia. The two days were structured so that every important policy group would have a chance to hear John Goodlad's ideas

about the simultaneous reform of teacher education and K-12. The morning of the first day was spent with the Center's 52 member Policy Board which includes a significant and vocal representative from K-12, colleges, legislature, agencies and business. The Board includes the last three teachers of the year, the elementary, middle and secondary principals associations, the two teacher "associations" (in a non-union state), the superintendents association for the K-12. All 28 approved programs of teacher education were represented by the dean. The Governor's office, the state Department of Education and the Commission of Higher Education were equally balanced with three legislators. Perhaps most significant were the business interests who had helped create the Center. John Goodlad's interaction with this group - the Center's Policy Board - made a significant and immediate impression on state policy makers about the importance of teacher education reform and raised the possibility of collaboration.

In the afternoon of the first day, John met with the vertical restructuring teams of the now 46 Associate Schools composed of teachers, principals, college partners, district personnel and business partners. At an invitational dinner for policy makers and decision makers hosted by the Center that night, John Goodlad interacted for four hours with the state's important stakeholders. Near midnight, one of the legislators finally asked directly: "What would it take to make it happen in South Carolina (simultaneous reform of K-12 and teacher education)?" As John answered the question, we began thinking in terms of significantly increasing the collaboration the Center had begun with the 46 restructuring Associate Schools and their individual college partners. In the second day of this initial "Regional Dialogue," John spoke to 800 invited educators from South Carolina and the southeastern states on the need for reform. He ended the day speaking with the state's Teacher Forum composed of all the past state and district teachers of the year. To say that this initial Center Regional Dialogue was successful is to wildly underestimate the impact John Goodlad had on the state. He raised the consciousness of every educator who heard him about the need for simultaneous reform and the possibility of the Center coordinating a collaboration.

In February 1991, John Goodlad and his Center for Educational Renewal at the University of Washington extended an invitation to teacher education colleges to compete for six national sites in his pilot year to implement the 19 Postulates to change teacher education. The initiative is the result of a massive five year study to find out why teacher education programs are not working, published in October 1990 in his book, TEACHERS FOR OUR NATION'S SCHOOLS. One conclusion was that K-12 schools and teacher education programs need to engage in simultaneous reform. The 19 Postulates concern raising the prestige of teacher education within the college community with more rewards for public school service, revising teacher education curriculum, providing cultural diversity, and establishing professional development schools. A president's commitment to a "Center of Pedagogy" is as important in

this reform as the districts sharing the responsibility for educating teachers.

Meanwhile the Center had hosted two more Regional Dialogues with Phil Schlechty at Winthrop and Art Wise at USC. All interested deans were invited to meet with the Center after the Art Wise Regional Dialogue to examine the invitation and the criteria for submitting a proposal to John Goodlad's group. Of the nine colleges who attended, five indicated that they were ready to move ahead on the Postulates and that they could complete the institutional self study required. The key factor in the proposal was, however, that the statewide Center for School Leadership be the focus of the collaboration since it was funded by the legislature and already had 46 partnerships underway.

The key factor of the Center as the focus has been overlooked by many states seeking a statewide collaboration. Many states see the South Carolina Collaborative as five colleges led by USC or Winthrop or Furman. Without the Center as the coordinator, it would be impossible to seek funding for private colleges or to make sure that K-12 schools were equal partners. With the Center and the restructuring Associate Schools model, Center budget from the legislature can be used for any K-12 school who has a college partner, public or private. If the SC Collaborative were led by a public college, no private college could be included in state funding.

South Carolina submitted a collaborative proposal to be coordinated by the South Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership since we already had underway a state funded program to help schools restructure and Associate Schools already allied with teacher education faculty. All approved teacher education colleges were invited to join with us in the proposal and five - Benedict, Columbia College, Furman, USC, and Winthrop - eventually completed the necessary self-study to submit the proposal.

The South Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership is the neutral coordinator for a collaborative of five colleges in the state. Because each Associate School in the Center's network was collaborating with a college partner and a business partner, the Center seemed the logical focal point to coordinate teacher education renewal. The five colleges represent a cross section of the state's population: a historically black college, a women's college, a private college, a research university, and a former teacher training college.

After much debate, John Goodlad and his staff chose South Carolina as one of eight national sites with the understanding that it would be the only collaborative project involving a state-funded Center, five representative colleges, and their partner Associate Schools already engaged in restructuring. The mission at each site is to change teacher education curriculum, to reward faculty for public school service, to establish professional development schools, and to provide cultural diversity. Each college must show within eighteen months that this work has begun. The ultimate goal is to influence state policy and to persuade other colleges toward Goodlad's agenda.

The Center for School Leadership coordinates the Goodlad Initiative in the state by disseminating information from Goodlad and his associates, by conducting training for colleges and professional development schools, by arranging site visits to other partnerships, and by facilitating partnership task forces. Thus far the Center has sponsored awareness and in-depth training to further the Goodlad Agenda. The first series was eight Regional Dialogues to discuss what could be done to improve teacher education. Each Dialogue was cosponsored by a local college and the surrounding school districts. National scholars such as John Goodlad and Phil Schlechty keynoted each Dialogue. Restructuring schools presented their progress, and the audience debated the improvement questions.

The second event involved taking teams from the SC Collaborative to Seattle to meet with teams from the other national sites and with Goodlad's consultants for training. The third effort brought two of Goodlad's senior associates to the state to provide training to college faculties and partner school faculties on how to establish professional development schools and on how to provide for cultural diversity in teacher education. The concluding effort in 1991-92 was a site visit to the most successful college/schools partnership: Provo/Brigham Young.

Adhering to the Center's pledge to share all information with all of its constituents the 1992-93 school year was busy one, both collectively and individually. Each of the five universities along with the teachers and administrators from their PDSs made site visits to the BYU/Provo and Maine partnerships. At the conclusion of these site visits, debriefing meetings were held and personal reflections were shared. Furtner site visits are planned via compressed video link with the University of Wyoming and other national sites using the technology of Hood Center at York Technical College.

Formal opportunities for sharing ideals and training within the SC Collaborative include an agreement to conduct a SC Collaborative Conference twice a year for sharing and learning among the six parties of the Collaborative, their Partner Schools and restructuring colleagues around the state. The first three SC Collaborative Conferences were sponsored by the Center for School Leadership and hosted on site by the collaborating colleges. The first was two separate whole day training workshops on DS development at Furman University, led by the Center for Educational Renewal's Richard Clark. Its purpose was to define and discuss professional development schools. Participants included faculties from the five colleges, all potential PDS faculty, and interested college and public school colleagues. The second Conference held by the SC Collaborative and hosted by Columbia College, Benedict, USC, and the Center was on Cultural Diversity led by Dr. June Gordon and Dr. Al Jones of CER. Six other cultural diversity players such as Cities in Schools helped the Collaborative learn how to instill diversity in teacher education and K-12. The third Conference led by CER's Richard Clark and Wilma Smith offered more sharing by the PDS/Partner Schools and showcased four of the most progressive partnerships in exploring the issues of governance, coaching, new

assessment, certification, and other hot issues in the state. The SC Collaborative Conferences will continue to be held twice a year for the Center, the five colleges, and their PDS/Partner schools to learn and share in formal ways.

The informal ways of learning belie the surface perception that the five colleges each develop separate agenda with no communication or collaboration. Each institution does develop its own criteria, relationships, and courses; but immediately and on purpose shares its experience with partners in the SC Collaborative. A specific illustration of this chain of learning is illustrated in the way Furman University established Partner Schools, Winthrop used their selection criteria instead of reinventing the wheel, and teams from Winthrop visited Pontiac Elementary to learn how to use the USC model of college faculty in the school for 75% of the assigned load for one semester.

Furman University sets Partner School Criteria

At Furman University, during the 1990-1991 school year, an Initial Planning Committee, made up of four university faculty, three principals, two district personnel, six teachers, and two parents met regularly to identify the processes by which this new collaborative relationship could emerge. From this year-long study, the Initial Planning Committee identified a shared vision of school renewal, of equitable decision-making, and reconceptualized education and the education of teachers by identifying the following needs for each constituent group in the collaborative:

Furman:

1) Increasing active involvement of teacher education faculty and students in the school setting. This includes becoming part of the on-going decision-making process, working as demonstration teachers, and conducting on-site seminars to discuss Furman student observations and hands-on experiences.

2) Building greater collaboration between university faculty, prospective teachers and practicing teachers, administrators and supervisors.

3) Creating opportunities for certification candidates to observe, critically evaluate, and incorporate into their own teaching a number of differing styles.

4) Giving Furman students opportunities to observe, study, and teach a population of learners who reflect the increasing diversity of American society.

5) Promoting risk taking to try new or experimental teaching practices in classroom laboratory settings.

Northwest Area:

1) Creating a vision for the education of a diverse population of children served by this area.

2) Developing and promoting exemplar models of effective programs for other school systems.

3) Providing staff development to marginal teachers.

4) Using additional persons to provide or assist in providing instruction to learners (Furman faculty and students).

5) Improving interaction and communication patterns with all persons involved in decision-making and program implementation, including college faculty and students.

6) Building reward systems for master teachers.

Subsequently, the Initial Planning Committee held informational meetings throughout the Northwest Area for all interested principals, faculty, administrators and parents regarding their suggestions for the Furman/Northwest Partnership.

In the spring of 1992, the Furman Teacher Education Department issued an invitation to all 20 schools in the Northwest Area to submit an application for consideration as a Professional Development School, beginning in the fall of 1992. Six applications were received and a panel of two state education representatives, one Center for School Leadership representative, and two representatives from the Commission on Higher Education selected five schools for the Furman/Northwest Partnership. Schools were selected on the basis of how well they were already demonstrating the following criteria: (a) evidence of an operational philosophy of continual renewal, (b) the extent to which the faculty, school staff, community and parents were part of the renewal plan, (c) evidence of shared governance systems, or the plans for moving toward shared governance, (d) the unique qualities of the school for professional development school status, and (e) the extent to which the school incorporated parents, community, and patron assistance in its educational endeavors. The five schools selected include two elementary schools (Slater-Marietta and Travelers Rest), two middle schools (Lakeview and Northwest), and one high school (Travelers Rest).

The Selection of Partner Schools at Winthrop

Borrowing from the work of our colleagues at Furman University, Winthrop approached the nine district superintendents about developing partner schools or pre-professional development schools. With their support and recommendations from our faculty, schools were selected to attend information sessions about becoming partner schools. Drawing on the 19 postulates proposed by Goodlad, an "Invitation to Participate" form was developed. Criteria for selection included evidence that 1) the school had a shared governance system or was moving rapidly toward one, 2) the school had an operational philosophy of renewal, 3) teaching faculty, school staff and the community (including parents) were committed to that philosophy. 4) Also schools explained why they wanted to be involved in the education of future teachers with Winthrop

University, and 5) if the majority of teachers were committed to establishing a partnership.

Proposals were evaluated by an external review committee of teachers and principals from other partner schools or Associate Schools affiliated with the Center for School Leadership, the state department of education, and the National Center for Educational Inquiry. The committee spent one and one-half days discussing the proposals and visiting the schools before recommending six schools for partnership, two middle schools and four elementary/primary schools. Of the nine school districts in the consortium, four had partner schools.
The selection process proved to be a very important beginning. The selection committee was racially representative of the school age population of the state (42%). The committee looked for schools where diversity was evident by also for schools where their seemed to be very high expectations for students and teachers. A critical criterion was that of the teacher's role in the governance of the school. Schools where there was not a clear movement toward shared decision making or where teachers did not have an active voice in their schools were not selected. The committee concluded that there was an energy in the final schools that led to their selection.

Once Winthrop's Partner Schools were selected in the spring of 1993, their energy became focused on bonding the eleven Winthrop faculty brokers with restructuring teams from the six Partner Schools. The Center for School Leadership put the schools on the electronic mail network and sponsored seminars in conflict resolution and the three day Managing Change Seminar. Teams from Winthrop's Partnership then made site visits to Pontiac to learn from the USC PDS operation.

Faculty Load in a USC Professional Development School

A USC professor is assigned a full time load at the partner school, Pontiac Elementary. She has an office at the school and teaches one graduate course and one methods course for six hours at the school. Her other six hours are supervising the 10 interns at Pontiac. She and a visiting professor from the University of Wyoming, teach a graduate course for eight teacher team leaders and two administrators. The course involves a reconceptualizing of curriculum by weekly interview assessment of students. The two professors teach the course for three hours every other week from noon until 3 during the school day. The professor does demonstration lessons in the eight classrooms and also coaches the teacher leaders as they implement the learned strategies immediately afterward.

The USC professor also teaches a course for the ten interns at Pontiac in which they learn the same techniques learned by the teacher leaders. Interns also immediately implement the strategies within their assigned classrooms with the professor coaching them. Triads develop so that the college teacher, the intern and the classroom teacher coach each other on new strategies they have learned. It is all so very convenient because they are all on site at the school and work with the

students the next day.

The side effects are not really side effects but are part of the grand scheme of intersecting Venn diagrams for collaboration. The eight teacher leaders and the two administrators begin teaching the new curriculum assessment strategies to other teachers as part of on site staff development. The interns can be in charge of classrooms from noon until 3 on alternate Tuesdays with a little support from substitutes, lunch, and integrated arts. The other partner schools with USC frequently meet at Pontiac and visit this triad collaboration for transfer to their own schools.

Funding is provided with a $4000 grant for partner school collaboration from the Center for School Leadership.

The Furman-Winthrop-Pontiac connection is only one illustration of the SC Collaborative advantage. We are all learning from Benedict's work with the neighborhood school and its valiant efforts in education for cultural diversity. Columbia College also led the way in 1991-92 in setting up four focus groups composed equally of Columbia College faculty and K-12 administrators and teachers. The four groups spent the whole academic year studying changes in teacher education curriculum, professional development schools, rewards, and cultural diversity. In a spring symposium the mixed groups made recommendations to the president and administration of the college and are still working on the implementation of the initial recommendations.

Institute for Educational Inquiry Associates: Five

In addition, the SC Collaborative has been most fortunate in having five national IEI Associates who each must conduct an inquiry project related to partnership development. The first of these was in collaboration with Lucy Snead who designed a one day symposium on high school/university partnerships at Columbia College, sponsored in part by the Institute for Educational Inquiry. With the active participation of an IEI Associate from California, the 75 participants shared the barriers and successes in the difficult secondary collaborations.

SC Collaborative and State Policy

As part of the Center's and the SC Collaborative's commitment to discuss and influence state policy, the Education Commission of the States met as facilitator with the SC Collaborative and the state agencies to listen to the needs and policy recommendations of the established PDS/Partner schools and the five collaborating colleges as they presented their progress, their needs, and their recommendations. Additionally this august group brain stormed ideas and suggestions for the future of the current 27 PDSs including energizing for the next wave of school reform in the state of SC: namely a state vision for teacher education reform. A writing team is now working with the outside facilitator to construct this vision and policy statement.

The Center also pledged to its Policy Board to share all

information and training with all other colleges in the state, not just the five in the Collaborative. All teacher education program representatives received all printed information and are invited to all training sessions. The Center provides technical assistance to other colleges interested in pursuing the Goodlad Agenda or in establishing professional development schools. Two colleges, Francis Marion and Converse, have begun plans for establishing partner schools. Charleston Southern, USC-Coastal, USC-Spartanburg, and Anderson College are in the process of establishing partnerships. The Commission on Higher Education has proposed that funding for professional development schools be included in the formula funding for teacher education.

In cooperation with the Education Commission of the States, Governor Campbell and the state coordinator created a statewide advisory committee to study the outcomes of the efforts of the five colleges and the application to state policy on teacher education.

The State Wide Advisory Group to Study the Goodlad Initiative includes:

Department of Education
Commission on Higher Education
Governor's Office
House Education Chair
Senate Education Chair
SC Center for School Leadership
Superintendent
Five Colleges Representative
SC Chamber of Commerce
Business/Education Subcommittee of the legislature

A singular side effect of the Center's involvement with the five colleges has been the national network connection and the ability to nominate national fellows to the new Philip Morris Institute for Educational Inquiry. As the Center's Director traveled to the colleges and their working partnerships, she was able to observe and discern where the real work was being done. As a result of this observation, we nominated three workers to serve as our first National Fellows: one public school person, one education faculty, and one non-education faculty active in the Center of Pedagogy concept. Claire Thompson of Nursery Road, Carol Nogy of Furman, and Lucy Snead of Columbia College were all selected as National Fellows in June 1992. They spent four separate weeks at the Institute for Educational Inquiry in Seattle where they learn and debate national education reform issues with sixteen other National Fellows. The three Fellows will share their learning and expertise with all interested college and PDS faculty. The Center for School Leadership provides the necessary coordination and travel.

In March 1993, two more National Fellows from South Carolina were selected to join the Institute for Educational Inquiry: Dr. Mickey Taylor from Winthrop and Dr. Sandra Winecoff from the University of South Carolina.

The five SC Associates in the Institute for Education Inquiry are part of the Center for School Leadership planning team for the semi-

annual SC Collaborative Conference on "Sharing and Learning within the SC Collaborative." These formalized opportunities for sharing success across the state are essential to the Collaborative's mission and vision.

COLLABORATION AMONG THE STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

One of the first initiatives to meet with success was the petition of the six part Goodlad Collaborative - the Center for School Leadership, Benedict, Columbia, Furman, USC, and Winthrop - to the state Board of Education in the initial year of the Goodlad Initiative. At the state Department of Education, the state Board of Education provided a waiver from state program review for three years for those colleges engaged in reforming teacher education in accordance with John Goodlad's 19 Postulates. At its December 1991 meeting, the state Board passed the waiver and expected to analyze the reforms initiated by the five colleges in 1994. Two college, Benedict and Furman, who were facing seven year NASDTEC studies during 1992-93 were able to concentrate instead on the Goodlad Initiative.

In 1991, Fred Sheheen, head of the Commission on Higher Education, formed a Collaborative Council in partnership with Barbara Nielsen, the state superintendent of education. The Council is composed of representatives from higher education, business, K-12 education and technical colleges to promote collaboration among their respective partners in the state. As one of its programs, the Council and the Governor appointed a Math/Science Advisory Board to write a state plan for math/science education in K-12 and in colleges. The Council supports the South Carolina Goodlad Collaborative and its input on collaboration and changes in state policy.

In addition to funding and supporting the South Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership, the South Carolina General Assembly in 1991 provided for $100,000 in the Center's operating budget for the support of the six part Goodlad Initiative in the state. In the second year of special funding, each of the five colleges used direct grants from the Center to study and establish professional development schools, now called Partner Schools.

The Commission on Higher Education began a study in October 1992 on providing direct funding for professional development schools. A committee has set up eight criteria for the step 12 funding in the state's formula funding for public colleges. The criteria include assigning five college faculty to each school, but do not include any internal commitment to restructuring or renewal.

At the end of the fiscal year 1992-93, the SC Collaborative meets with ECS and state policy advisors on recommendations for changes in teacher education policy, certification and regulation. *
dated after April 28, 1993.*

Legislative initiatives for the next year include combining all the state's incentive programs into restructuring grants for all of the

1148 schools in the state. The $5000 planning grants will be supplemented with technical assistance from the Center for School Leadership and the state Department of Education. * May Update*

SUMMARY OF LESSONS LEARNED FOR ESTABLISHING OTHER STATEWIDE COLLABORATIVES

The major lesson learned from the six party South Carolina collaborative, headed by the neutral Center for School Leadership, has been the integrity of the collaborators. Before any collaborative effort can be projected for a state, the interested parties must have

1. a neutral organization for collaboration (like the Center for School Leadership) which is neither a university nor a state agency
2. an internal commitment to restructuring/renewal,
3. leadership and/or engagement from the education committees in the legislature,
4. leadership and/or engagement from the significant business sector interested in education and the economy,
5. consistent leadership within each collaborating unit and/or an extremely strong grass roots effort and leadership among teaching faculty,
6. extremely strong commitment to regard school people as equal partners,
7. persons who believe in a principled leadership style with their basic integrity intact,
8. persons who have a commitment to the simultaneous renewal and restructuring of public schools, colleges, universities, and governance structures,
9. persons who are risk takers,
10. persons committed to the art and process of collaboration and negotiation, not capitulation,
11. a governance structure not encumbered by inflexible mandates,
12. a shared decision making process (such as the Center's model of Participatory Decision Making) to permit open input at college and K-12 teams,
13. decision making at the grass roots level so that persons closest to the decision implementation share in making the decisions,
14. numerous opportunities for the study, dialogue, and exchange of pedagogically sound practices,
15. leaders who actively listen,
16. a reward structure that encourages and supports the exchange and sharing of resources, both human and financial, and
    most important
17. subjugated territoriality to the interests of the greater

good for future teachers and K-12 students in the state.

Although it is fairly easy to rely on a non-college coordinator such as the Center for School Leadership, the Collaborative does not advance unless each partner fulfills its original commitment. With financial troubles plaguing one college, the Collaborative saw an evident weakness. The weakness that was not so evident was another partner who from lack of leadership or commitment stalled for eighteen months with lip service to the collaborative and to partner schools. The large grant that other colleges used to establish partner schools went unspent in the sixth partner. After twenty one partner schools had been established by the four colleges, the fifth finally selected six partner schools with outside and budgetary pressure.

The most positive force in the state's collaboration has been the commitment of the Senate Education Committee to support $100,000 in the Center's operating budget for the Collaborative, partner schools, and changes in teacher education curriculum. Without that money as a lever, the five colleges would have been hard pressed to find the funds and the time to establish partner schools and to change the mindset of faculty to use partner schools to drive teacher education curriculum.

Pooling resources is the next most important criteria for a collaborative. Despite the facts that individual grants and matching college money can create local partner schools, the training and sharing must be a joint venture. The Center for School Leadership has been able to sponsor seminars on PDS and a conference on cultural diversity, but more public school faculty attended the early efforts than teacher education faculty. The guiding committee has agreed to hold two major training events each year for equal populations of college and K-12 faculty. The next is a learning/sharing two day seminar for all partner schools in early August.

The events that turned the collaborative toward more positive action were the site visits the Center arranged for college faculty. About fifty people have been able to visit the Provo/BYU Partnership in Utah, the New Jersey alliance, southern Maine's rural consortium, Boston's urban partnerships, and Denver's consortium of partner schools and three colleges. When faculty could see successful operations of partner schools, they could more readily form their own working definitions and work toward their own ideal. The white majority and district funding we saw in Provo will not work in South Carolina, but we saw much that would and that we could adapt. New Jersey's urban experience is alien to our rural state, but we can use some of their formal arrangements.

After two years, the South Carolina Collaborative is now a working organization. All the cogs are now turning the wheels to renew teacher education. When the last college moved to establish partner schools, we could see the collaborative becoming firm. It needs to be firm with the storms of budget cuts and restructuring state agencies on the horizon for the next fiscal year.

The SC Collaborative and the state agencies

The SC Collaborative has faced some unique challenges in dealing with state agencies. The first comes from the fact that the Center was set up by the legislature to help all schools and colleges in restructuring. The second challenge is the fact that the Goodlad Initiative in South Carolina is coordinated by the Center instead of by one college in one state as is true in the other 14 national sites.

These two unique challenges, however, have also been the prelude to the major advantages. Because the SC Collaborative is headed by a neutral Center for School Leadership, the Center could petition the state superintendent and in turn the state Board of Education for a waiver for the experimental model so that the five colleges would not have to stop and undergo the state program approval process for three years. At the end of the period, the waiver will allow the colleges to use the successful experiment for approval. Other waiver dealing with supervision and more involvement with the K-12 schools in the teacher preparation process are being prepared so that no college gets favored but through the Center as coordinator, waivers become part of the experiment to improve state policy to be spread to all colleges. The challenge for the Collaborative is to establish the 19 Postulates as the guiding force for teacher education approval and to establish partner schools as the structure for the reform of teacher education in fifty-fifty partnerships with districts and schools.

The Spin-Off Advantage

Since 1991, the Center for School Leadership has been the primary training and resource unit for the Carnegie TURNING POINTS grant for the state of South Carolina. Working with the state Budget and Control Board, the Center has provided special training and resources for the original 24 middle schools who are Associate Schools in the Center's restructuring network. The Center has provided training for these middle schools and other interested in TURNING POINTS in participatory decision making and teaming. Currently the Center has used its original restructuring umbrella to assist in teacher training for middle schools by coordinating the findings of the Goodlad Initiative with its 27 professional development schools with the four colleges who are piloting middle schools teacher training and establishing middle schools as professional development schools.

Advantages of a Statewide Collaborative

The overwhelming advantage of having a statewide collaborative headed by a neutral party is that the collaborative can model in macrocosm what they preach in microcosm. The teacher/classroom relationship can be reflected in the principal/teacher relationship, in the college/Partner school relationship, in the Center/college

relationship, and in the Collaborative/state agency relationship. The idea that decision makers such as teachers should be involved in making school policy and decisions is echoed in the way colleges deal with Partner Schools in decision making and in the way the Center deals with colleges and schools in the SC Collaborative. All our relationships consist of talking around a table with an open agenda. Webbing and networking take place on a daily basis within the SC Collaborative and with our colleagues around the state. Of course, electronic mail and the Center-supported network make this easier, but now at every meeting we see the principle extended. SC Collaborative deans represent both their institutions and the Collaborative at state meetings such as the task force to change program approval and the Collaboratives Council. The Center for School Leadership Director represents the Center and the Collaborative as she works on the Governor's Math/Science Advisory Board, the Carnegie Middle Schools Project, the Lieutenant Governor's LEGACY Council for At-Risk Students among others.

The strength of the SC Collaborative is that it is not owned by any one party. The Center's who is also the site director for the Goodlad Initiative works with a statewide collaborative group (its Policy Board). This brings to the surface a leadership style which reinforces networking and collaboration. The Center's director meets monthly with deans of the five collaborating colleges, partner school representatives, and arts and sciences representatives to discuss issues, progress, and activities; but she also opens the meeting each month to state agencies, the legislature, and other colleges and schools. Anyone can have input into the Collaborative. The Center's director also meets periodically with other restructuring colleges and their Associate Schools. The Center has sponsored a restructuring sharing conference with Coastal Carolina, cultural diversity seminars with Anderson and Newberry College faculty, partnership seminars with Francis Marion University, Center of Pedagogy meetings with Converse, and district/university relations with South Carolina State University.

In the end as in the beginning, the strength of the SC Collaborative is grass roots people meeting in a room with an open agenda to find out what is wrong with the operation of schools and teacher preparation. Grass roots people of good will, willing to give up territoriality and their own bureaucracy, are making it happen in our state.

With state funding in short supply and a movement underway to directly fund partner schools for public colleges with few restrictive criteria, the SC Collaborative must make sure that their changes are strongly reinforced and are working toward the ideal partnership between colleges and schools. Otherwise public funds will be allocated to any college who decides to set up professional development schools without the school's commitment to restructuring or with the college's internal commitment to the Goodlad's Postulates or the Holmes principles. If there is no guiding principle or school commitment, the state funding will become replacement money for traditional programs. In the absence of principled criteria, any college can "work" in schools and call the

relationship a professional development school.

Advice to Other States

Our advice to other states is to seek a collaborative headed by a neutral party such as the Center for School Leadership, but to make sure that the ideas keep coming from the grass roots for the grass roots. We need to tell ourselves and others to resist the mandates and partial funding which might come down from above to reinforce part of an idea or to spread faster an experimental process which has had only two or three years to develop. Trying to spread an incompletely explored idea faster than its growth warrants is just as dangerous as losing funding. In the end, funding for partner schools must become a part of how each teacher preparation program does business. Partner schools will then depend on reallocated money and time rather than on proposals or closed, year to year mandated funding. When partner schools become institutionalized within each college and when collaboratives and networks are part of our daily business, we will have succeeded in setting up the structure of what we need to do. We think the SC Collaborative is well on its way and a good model for other states, but we will not deny the excruciating nature of the hard work it involves.

At the current crossroads, the SC Collaborative must present a united front with strong commitment to Partner Schools at each of the five colleges and with the continuing coordinating facilities of the neutral Center for School Leadership. In the words of Ben Franklin, we all hang together or (in the recession), we all hang separately. If we close this window of opportunity upon ourselves, we will not see another window open.

APPENDIX A

1. The Winthrop University/Public School Partnership
Reshaping a Long-Standing Relationship

Winthrop University, drawing on its strong normal school tradition, recruits and trains one of the largest cadres of student teachers in South Carolina. Winthrop was the first institution in the state to introduce clinical experiences and teaching seminars during the first two years of its undergraduate education program. It houses the Center for School Leadership which directs a network of 103 restructuring schools and 28 programs of teacher education. It also houses the South

Carolina Teacher Recruitment Center which through its Teacher Cadet Corps and its Pro-Team is recruiting the best and the brightest of middle and high school students into teacher education. Winthrop provides technical and administrative support to the nine school districts in the area through its Olde English Consortium. Winthrop is a member of the Renaissance Group and Project 30.

Winthrop University, the host institution for the South Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership (CENTER: Center for School Leadership), and a member of the National Network for Educational Renewal, has a long and rich history higher education/public school collaboration. For 20 years it has enjoyed a positive working relationship with school districts within a 30 mile radius of the university. High quality students, early and diverse field experiences, courses team taught by professors and public school involvement in the admission of students into teacher education have been components of Winthrop's program for many years. Each year, approximately 225 students majoring in early childhood through secondary education, graduate and seek employment in the region's schools. What follows is a description of an arrangement between a small comprehensive university and nine school districts that is in the process of being reshaped so both parties can reap the benefits of partnership work.

Early Efforts at Partnership

In 1973 Winthrop, then a college, formed a consortial relationship with school districts from five counties in South Carolina's upstate. After four years of an informal relationship, district superintendents, in conjunction with the dean of education and the college president, formed a Board of Governors, the oversight body for the consortium. The early charter for the consortium stated, "The purposes of the consortium are 1) to provide a mechanism for school-college cooperation in efforts to remedy or mitigate fundamental educational, managerial and administrative problems, 2) to provide a framework for research and development activities which have general benefit and 3) to provide a new model of school-college cooperation with all attending public relations values."

During the years, over 15 networks were formed to carry out the purposes of the consortium e.g., personnel, guidance, special education, secondary education, writing, staff development. Winthrop faculty were actively involved in the networks, providing consultation and inservice to a number of schools. The college paid the salary of a full-time director, also a professor at the college, and the school districts paid for a full-time secretary.

The Teachers in Residence Program was a major initiative in the early years of the partnership. In 1985 Winthrop recruited nine outstanding teachers from the Olde English Consortium to spend a semester at Winthrop, assisting in the revision of the undergraduate teacher education program, co-teaching methods courses and bringing a public school perspective to the preparation of teachers. Aside from

the wealth of expertise these teachers provided in shaping the program, all have gone on to leadership positions in education. One completed her Ph.D. in mathematics education and is a professor and clinical supervisor of math education students at Winthrop. Another is principal at one of our six partner schools which is considered to be one of the most advanced in restructuring and site based decision making in the state.

In 1983, the Consortium made efforts to create what might have been forerunners of professional development schools or "Teaching Learning Centers" (TLC's). These eight schools were designated to serve as practicuum sites for preservice students in early phases of the teacher education program. Approximately 380 students per year observed and participated in the TLC's Students completed focused observations, interviewed panels of teachers, students and administrators, and completed self assessments of their suitability for careers in education. Incentives for the schools included adjunct faculty status for teachers, priority for inservice, access to the college library, vouchers for courses, campus parking permits, use of recreational facilities and discounts for fine arts events.

Many positive and lasting experiences came from the Teaching Learning Center partnership but over several years the relationship became strained. The schools began to feel overburdened by the number of preservice students in their classrooms. Winthrop faculty were overwhelmed by the number of requests they received for inservice workshops and resented that University administrators had made commitments to the partnership that extended far beyond their individual commitments. It was a marriage gone bad. Finally in 1991, the district and the university mutually agreed to explore alternatives to the TLC's as a result of Winthrop's involvement in the Goodlad Initiative.

Rationale for Forming a New Partnership

It was in this atmosphere that Winthrop faculty began discussions about partnerships based on the simultaneous renewal of teacher education and public education. We had gone through a successful review by NCATE in October 1991 and by all intents and purposes were doing well. In addition, we had been selected as one of five institutions in the state (Winthrop University, Furman University, University of South Carolina-Columbia, Benedict College and Columbia College) in conjunction with the South Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership, to form the South Carolina Collaborative, a member of the National Network for Educational Renewal. However, as a result of the recent problems with the TLC's, faculty were hesitant to embrace new arrangements with the schools without a clear understanding of their role. They knew that partnership work is time and resource hungry and questioned how collaboration with the schools would affect promotion and tenure decisions.

Some believed we were involved with the schools more than many institutions. Our students had field experiences from their freshman

year and we had received permission from the state board of education to offer student teaching over two semesters. We attracted high quality students to our program and our graduates had a high rate of employment. Some thought Winthrop was doing well and there was little to gain and perhaps something to lose by venturing into the uncharted waters of simultaneous renewal, especially during times of extreme budget constraints.

That aside, our faculty also knew that recent graduates reported they "hit the wall" when it came to dealing with issues such as working with parents, interfacing with social service agencies and the vast amount of testing in public education, children of poverty, families with lifestyles dissimilar to their own and the isolation of teaching. Many new teachers reinforced the notion that student teachers and teachers learn to teach on the job not at the university.

University faculty had their own concerns. Those who were active in the supervision of student teachers frequently commiserated over the unchanging curricula in public education and were concerned that their efforts at teaching students alternative instructional strategies, problem solving techniques and appropriate classroom management techniques were too frequently laid aside once students were no longer interns. Statements such as "I can't believe our students are inundating young children with product art and worksheets" were frequent. We rung our hands as to what was wrong with the public schools. If only teachers would do what we trained them to do, education would improve.

Faculty Commitment: Site Visits and Focus Groups

While individual faculty had attended conferences associated with the National Network, some faculty remained unaware of the fast growing support at the state and national level for university public school partnerships. One of the most effective ways of building support for collaboration with the public schools was to provide faculty opportunities to visit other sites in the National Network. Through funding from the South Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership, seven faculty spent five days in October 1992 visiting the Brigham Young University/Public School Partnership. In November another group visited the University of Southern Maine/Portland Partnership. Aside from being an excellent professional development opportunity for faculty, it created excitement with a small core that has proven to be contagious. They wrote reports and shared their experiences with colleagues at a monthly faculty meeting. Their credibility as faculty leaders as been critical in keeping partnership work as a priority.

In addition, faculty agreed to explore three key areas in focus groups: 1) school/university partnerships, 2) diversity in field placements and the curriculum, and 3) revisions in the teacher education curriculum. A focusing question was "How can partner schools influence the teacher education program and visa versa." Faculty expressed an interest in one or more of the groups and began to meet once a week.

Groups were charged with making recommendations to the School of Education faculty by the end of the spring term. Two groups chose to continue their work through the summer. Resources critical to their work were made available and every faculty member received a copy of Teachers for Our Nation's Schools.

Faculty took turns reading seminal works and leading discussions. This process of focusing on the literature rather than on Winthrop's existing program proved to bring a level of openness and exploration of ideas to the discussions. Quickly, the importance of working with the public schools emerged as a theme in the diversity and curriculum reform groups. In turn, the partnership group discussed how schools might be selected for a pilot relationship and how faculty might function in these schools.

The Selection of Partner Schools

Borrowing from the work of our colleagues at Furman University, we approached the nine district superintendents about developing partner schools or pre-professional development schools. With their support and recommendations from our faculty, schools were selected to attend information sessions about becoming partner schools. Drawing on the 19 postulates proposed by Goodlad, an "Invitation to Participate" form was developed. Criteria for selection included evidence that 1) the school had a shared governance system or was moving rapidly toward one, 2) the school had an operational philosophy of renewal, 3) teaching faculty, school staff and the community (including parents) were committed to that philosophy. 4) Also schools explained why they wanted to be involved in the education of future teachers with Winthrop University, and 5) if the majority of teachers were committed to establishing a partnership.

Proposals were evaluated by an external review committee of teachers and principals from other partner schools or Associate Schools affiliated with the Center for School Leadership, the state department of education, and the National Center for Educational Inquiry. The committee spent one and one-half days discussing the proposals and visiting the schools before recommending six schools for partnership, two middle schools and four elementary/primary schools. Of the nine school districts in the consortium, four had partner schools.

The selection process proved to be a very important beginning. The selection committee was racially representative of the school age population of the state (42%). The committee looked for schools where diversity was evident by also for schools where their seemed to be very high expectations for students and teachers. A critical criterion was that of the teacher's role in the governance of the school. Schools where there was not a clear movement toward shared decision making or where teachers did not have an active voice in their schools were not selected. The committee concluded that there was an energy in the final schools that led to their selection.

Lessons Learned and Future Directions

Winthrop's desire for involvement with the National Network for Educational Renewal was predicated on the belief that teacher education and public education need each other. We now have 11 faculty "brokers" who are working with school planning teams to set objectives for the coming year. This summer a two-day retreat on Managing Change is planned for the teams and brokers. We are meeting frequently, discussing the benefits and fears of partnership and getting to know and trust each other. All six schools will develop separate contracts with the University based on a mutual agenda: a commitment to the professionalization of teaching and the improved preparation of teachers. By next year we hope to develop a partnership with an urban school in Charlotte, North Carolina.

In retrospect, we have learned a lot from our long history of collaboration that will serve us well as we build new and different partnerships with the public schools. Trust, a shared vision and a commitment to long term change are critical if we are to create the types of teacher education programs we will need for students in the 21st century. Through our earlier problems in forming a partnership we are moving more slowly and resisting the temptation to make commitments we may not be able to keep. This time the stakes are very high and we cannot afford to fail.

PARTNER SCHOOLS WITH A HOLMES INSTITUTION

USC IN COLUMBIA

The University of South Carolina, a member of the Holmes Group, relies on a Professional Education Unit, supported by the Colleges of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences, and Science and Mathematics to prepare new teachers for initial certification while they earn degrees in selected disciplines. In 1990, USC awarded 442 master's degrees in education, 45 specialist degrees, and 50 doctoral degrees. In 1991, USC began the design of its first professional development schools using the Holmes and Goodlad criteria. The Center for Policy Studies, which conducts major research in policy and practice is located at USC. USC is also one of the field test centers for the National Board for Performance in Teaching Standards to field test the exam in 25 South Carolina school districts.

As a member of the Holmes Group, USC had a head start on the other members of the collaborative in investigating the partner school relationship. Faculty from the College of Education were encouraged to invite colleagues from local schools which they thought would be good partners. At planning meetings with College of Education faculty and arts and sciences faculty who participate in planning with students to enter professional education, some of the schools self-selected out. USC offered to these interested schools a year long restructuring institute in the form of a six hour credit course where teachers and administrators would inquire into the definition and criteria for partner schools.

As the concluding event of the institute, schools were invited to write a proposal for working in partnership with USC. In April 1992,

eleven schools presented oral and written proposals in a group meeting with representatives from USC, John Goodlad's Center for Educational Renewal, and the SC Center for School Leadership. From that group of eleven, USC began partnerships, later adding a high school who had not participated in the institute. All of the agreements with the partner schools include keep the local district office informed and supportive.

USC is using the progress in the clinical setting to plan for a Center of Pedagogy. Plans for this Center include presidential support, involvement of arts and sciences and development of alternative guidelines for promotion and tenure. The Center of Pedagogy might have presidential recognition for Arts and Sciences faculty who work in teacher education but also retain their affiliation with their academic unit.

An example of how a USC Partner School operates will give an overview of the model. Pontiac Elementary has 623 students in grade K-5 and 37 teachers. It is an Associate School within the Center for School Leadership's restructuring network and therefore has a previous internal commitment to restructuring. As do all the new schools in the network, it has a partnership with another restructuring schools in the network, Keels. Therefore Pontiac is both a restructuring partner with the Center, Keels, and USC and a partner-professional development schools with USC.

Dr. Chris Ebert is a USC professor whose full time load is in Pontiac Elementary. She has an office at the school and teaches one graduate course and one methods course for six hours at the school. Her other six hours are supervising the 10 interns at Pontiac. Christ and Joe Rees, a visiting professor from the University of Wyoming, teach a graduate course for eight teacher team leaders and two administrators. The course involves a reconceptualizing of curriculum by weekly interview assessment of students. Chris and Joe teach the course for three hours every other week from noon until 3 during the school day. Chris does demonstration lessons in the eight classrooms and also coaches the teacher leaders as they implement the learned strategies immediately afterward.

Chris also teach a course for the ten interns at Pontiac in which they learn the same techniques learned by the teacher leaders. Interns also immediately implement the strategies within their assigned classrooms with Chris coaching them. Triads develop so that the college teacher, the intern and the classroom teacher coach each other on new strategies they have learned. It is all so very convenient because they are all on site at the school and work with the students the next day.

The side effects are not really side effects but are part of the grand scheme of intersecting Venn diagrams for collaboration. The eight teacher leaders and the two administrators begin teaching the new curriculum assessment strategies to other teachers as part of on site staff development. The interns can be in charge of classrooms from noon until 3 on alternate Tuesdays with a little support from substitutes, lunch, and integrated arts. The other partner schools with USC

frequently meet at Pontiac and visit this triad collaboration for transfer to their own schools.

Funding is provided with a $4000 grant for partner school collaboration from the Center for School Leadership.

BENEDICT AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL

Benedict College, the state's largest historically black private institution, began a major revitalization of its teacher education program in 1986. Benedict is the only private college in South Carolina to receive annual support ($150,00 in 1990) from the state legislature for programs to attract more minority youngsters into teacher education. The MATE program provides on-campus summer experiences to high school juniors and in linked to Pre-MATE clubs at more than 20 rural high schools throughout the state.

Benedict has a major grant from Coca-Cola Foundation to train retired military, especially minority males, to teach in elementary schools.

Benedict College, as the state's largest private historically black institution, developed early on commitments to cultural diversity in teacher education and to working with neighborhood schools with the urban, high minority populations. Benedict's association with the restructuring network and the Center for School Leadership began with a science professor who agreed to work on science education with Webber School, a CD-8 rural school with a large minority population.

Benedict is now concentrating on one neighborhood school, Lyon Street Elementary and its high concentration of Chapter 1 programs. Benedict early sought the involvement of Arts and Sciences faculty and administrative commitment to the neighborhood school partnership. They have faculty approval for the revised teacher education curriculum which includes early freshman clinical experience and cohorts of majors.

Benedict's outstanding professor award winner leads a class of students in discovery and inquiry into cultural diversity among the parent and student population. College faculty taught a science and health methods course at Lyon Street in the fall and in the spring Lyon Street faculty will teach Chapter 1 reading methods on the college campus.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE: WOMEN STUDENTS AND ECONOMIC PLACEMENTS

Columbia College is a 150 year old Methodist supported private college for women with a historic commitment to the training of teachers. About 20 percent of the college's students are minorities, and more than 40 percent of its graduates receive teacher certification each year. During his tenure, President Peter Mitchell has focused the college's attention on the issues raised in Goldberger's Women's Ways of Knowing and has now established the Leadership Center for Women on the campus to provide leadership training for undergraduates and women leaders.

As one of the few remaining women's colleges in the United States,

Columbia College had a particular challenge in setting up partner schools. Columbia's education majors have in the past been placed in largely suburban, low minority schools in high socioeconomic neighborhoods such as Lexington and Irmo. With the commitment to the Goodlad Postulates and the crying need for cultural diversity, Columbia's chair took the initiative to get public school and school district input before she expanded partnerships beyond Columbia' s traditionalist placements for its women major and student teachers.

During the academic year 1991-1992, Columbia used a $10,000 grant from the Center for School Leadership to set up four focus groups to study recommendations to the education department and Columbia's president, Peter Mitchell, by the end of the year. The four focus groups were on professional development schools, cultural diversity, teacher education curriculum revisions, and reward systems for college and K-12. The focus groups were composed of equal numbers of K-12 teachers and administrators and Columbia faculty. The groups met for study, research, inquiry and site visits every month during the school year. At a symposium in May, each group presented its recommendations to Columbia College.

The guiding principle of the recommendations was that partner school involvement would drive changes in teacher education curriculum. Many changes were instituted that revised the freshman and senior year placements to an earlier cohort group for clinical experiences and for student teacher placements. Changes were recommended for a two year prospective for the second and third year of teacher education.

Columbia has retained its traditional placements in Irmo schools because those schools were also leaders in the Center's restructuring network and could offer advanced collaborations with expert faculty. Classes are now taught at Nursery Road Elementary for Columbia education majors to coincide with their observations and clinical experience. Both Columbia faculty and Nursery Road teachers and administrators teach the courses and supervise the clinical students.

In addition, Columbia has expanded its urban commitment by forming a partnership with Corley Elementary to give its majors a more diverse economic and ethnic placement.

FURMAN UNIVERSITY AND THE NORTHWEST AREA PARTNERSHIP

Furman University is recognized as one of the outstanding private liberal arts universities in the southeast. Founded in 1826 and in affiliation with the Southern Baptist tradition, Furman has a co-ed enrollment of 2200 students. Most students are required to take a core liberal arts curriculum. Since the selection of Dr. Herbert Tyler, superintendent of the state's largest school district, as Department Chair eight years ago, the education department has undergone a renaissance, including the establishment of a clinically oriented curriculum and the creation of the Upstate Consortium, which is the only one which provides restructuring training to college faculty and area school districts.

Furman University, a small private liberal arts college, regarded as a leader among other private liberal arts programs nationally and state-wide came into the South Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership collaborative as a logical extension of its six-year history with the Upstate Schools Consortium of 13 school districts, its extensive two-year involvement with the South Carolina Associate Schools network, and its five-year self-study Redesign Project in the Teacher Education Program. The theme of the redesigned teacher education program, ReLearners and Learning In a Changing worlds, encapsulates the shared mission of the simultaneous renewal of K-12 schools and the education of educators now happening nation-wide and in South Carolina.

In order to move forward the necessary agenda for educational reform, as described in Dr. John Goodlad's books, Teachers for Our nation's Schools and The Moral Dimensions of Teaching, the Furman education faculty proposed a university-public school collaborative to the Northwest Areas Schools in the School District of Greenville County, the geographic area within which Furman University is located. The proposed collaborative utilized a Professional Development Schools model.

During the 1990-1991 school year, an Initial Planning Committee, made up of four university faculty, three principals, two district personnel, six teachers, and two parents met regularly to identify the processes by which this new collaborative relationship could emerge. From this year-long study, the Initial Planning Committee identified a shared vision of school renewal, of equitable decision-making, and reconceptualized education and the education of teachers by identifying the following needs for each constituent group in the collaborative:

Furman:

1) Increasing active involvement of teacher education faculty and students in the school setting. This includes becoming part of the on-going decision-making process, working as demonstration teachers, and conducting on-site seminars to discuss Furman student observations and hands-on experiences.

2) Building greater collaboration between university faculty, prospective teachers and practicing teachers, administrators and supervisors.

3) Creating opportunities for certification candidates to observe, critically evaluate, and incorporate into their own teaching a number of differing styles.

4) Giving Furman students opportunities to observe, study, and teach a population of learners who reflect the increasing diversity of American society.

5) Promoting risk taking to try new or experimental teaching practices in classroom laboratory settings.

Northwest Area:

1) Creating a vision for the education of a diverse population of children served by this area.

2) Developing and promoting exemplar models of effective programs for other school systems.

3) Providing staff development to marginal teachers.

4) Using additional persons to provide or assist in providing instruction to learners (Furman faculty and students).

5) Improving interaction and communication patterns with all persons involved in decision-making and program implementation, including college faculty and students.

6) Building reward systems for master teachers.

Subsequently, the Initial Planning Committee held informational meetings throughout the Northwest Area for all interested principals, faculty, administrators and parents regarding their suggestions for the Furman/Northwest Partnership.

In the spring of 1992, the Furman Teacher Education Department issued an invitation to all 20 schools in the Northwest Area to submit an application for consideration as a Professional Development School, beginning in the fall of 1992. Six applications were received and a panel of two state education representatives, one Center for School Leadership representative, and two representatives from the Commission on Higher Education selected five schools for the Furman/Northwest Partnership. Schools were selected on the basis of how well they were already demonstrating the following criteria: (a) evidence of an operational philosophy of continual renewal, (b) the extent to which the faculty, school staff, community and parents were part of the renewal plan, (c)evidence of shared governance systems, or the plans for moving toward shared governance, (d) the unique qualities of the school for professional development school status, and (e) the extent to which the school incorporated parents, community, and patron assistance in its educational endeavors. The five schools selected include two elementary schools (Slater-Marietta and Travelers Rest), two middle schools (Lakeview and Northwest), and one high school (Travelers Rest).

At the conclusion of the Professional Development Schools selection process, five Furman teacher education faculty volunteered to participate as the Furman/Northwest Partnership liaisons, one per school. A Steering Committee made up of the five partnership faculty liaisons, the five Professional Development School principals, two area consultants, one area assistant superintendent, and the education department chairperson, convened for the first time in September, 1992. Simultaneously, the five Professional Development School faculty each selected an internal PDS committee, comprised of five to twelve school teachers and staff, depending on the size of each school. These six groups, the PDS Steering Committee and the PDS internal committees, meet regularly to move the partnership agenda for school reform forward.

The agenda for the Furman/Northwest Partnership, in this its first year, is proceeding with the following activities: (a) providing opportunities for the PDS Steering Committee and PDS Committee members

to visit models of university-school partnerships and other professional development schools, (b) designing a vision that includes the active involvement of the teacher education faculty, the arts and science faculty and students at Furman, public school personnel, and community representatives for improving education for the diverse population of children served in the Northwest area, (c) establishing cohort groups within each Professional Development School comprised of Furman University Teacher Education faculty and students, school personnel, parent and community representatives that will continue the dialogue process for the partnership and school reform, (d) identifying incentives for all active partnership members, and, (e) designing and beginning pilot studies which include Furman students and faculty systematically and constructively in the school site, involving early experiences, preservice experiences and student teaching experiences. Each constituent of the Furman/Northwest Partnership is at a different phase within the above stated agenda.

Implicit within the agenda for the Furman/Northwest Partnership, in year one, is the need for continuous and simultaneous staff development for all the partnership constituents. The current staff development needs for the partnership have been accommodated in several ways. First, full-day training seminars on Strategic Planning for Professional Development schools (conducted in part by the Brigham Young/Provo Partnership staff); Managing Change As A Process (conducted by the South Carolina Center for Educational Leadership); and Diversity in the Curriculum and in Teacher Education (conducted in part by Dr. June Gordon of the Center for Educational Renewal) occurred in October, 1992 and February, 1993. All seminars were attended by the Professional Development School teams, Furman education and arts and sciences faculty, area consultants, and one area superintendent.

Secondly, a two-term course for the Professional Development School teachers in the two Furman/Northwest Partnership Middle Schools, occurred from September to February, 1992-93. Sponsored in part by the South Carolina State Department of Education, this course, taught by Furman education faculty, is continuing.

Thirdly, each Furman/Northwest Professional Development School has sent teams of their teachers and staff, out of state, to visit model schools utilizing ReLearning Style curriculum. Additionally, each PDS is completing a year-long staff development plan that includes training on such topics as de-tracking, whole-language, and school reform which Furman faculty and student teachers attend.

As the Furman/Northwest Partnership looks forward to year two of its collaborative, the Professional Development School agenda will grow and change, as the constituents grow and change. Involvement of each Professional Development schools SIC (School Improvement Council), which is comprised of parents, will be an added dimension to the agenda; and the Professional Development schools partner schools will become part of the network of schools and universities engaged in school reform in the upstate.